

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/614,325	07/07/2003	Peter R. Voorheis	B02-31	7363
7590 01/04/2005			EXAMINER	
William B. Lacy			BUTTNER, DAVID J	
Acushnet Comp	any			
PO Box 965			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fairhaven, MA 02719-0965			1712	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/614,325	VOORHEIS, PETER R.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		David Buttner	1712			
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE M - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SiX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition	on of Claims		•			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application	on Papers		·			
9) 🗌 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) 🔲 🗆	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	, ,	•			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureace the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment	` ′					
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail				
3) 🛛 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/614,325

Art Unit: 1712

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5-8,10-26 and 28-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The "carbon-carbon" initiator limitation is unclear in the absence of a clear structure or definition. It appears applicant intends to exclude peroxide initiators (page 9 line 18). However, peroxides do have carbon to carbon bonds. In the interest of clarity, the claims should either explicitly recite the specification's definition or recite a structure.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14,16,17,22-27 and 30-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton 2002/0006837 in view of Aoki '763 or Amtmann '080.

Dalton suggests urethane covered multilayer golf balls (abstract). There can be a hard inner cover and a soft outer cover (paragraph 185). The core can be at least 1.58" (paragraph 48). The core is made of polybutadiene of 45-60 Mooney (paragraph 88). A free radical source (typically a peroxide) is used to facilitate cure. (paragraph 106). Dalton does not suggest the class of free radical initiators claimed by applicant.

Such free radical initiators are known for curing polybutadiene (see Aoki's table).

These initiators are superior to peroxides in the resulting bending strength, bending

modulus, heat distortion (see Aoki's table) and crosslinking amount (col 1 line 48-52 of Aoki). Furthermore, these initiators do not suffer from the odors etc of peroxides (col 1 line 45-49 of Amtmann). It would have been obvious to choose Aoki's initiator in place of Dalton's peroxides for the expected improvements.

Claims 1-13,16,17,21-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi '692 in view of Aoki '763 or Amtmann '080.

Higuchi exemplifies cores for urethane covered golf balls (table 1). The cores contain polybutadiene, zinc diacrylate peroxide pentachlorothiophenol etc. Higuchi does not suggest the class of free radical initiators claimed by applicant.

Such free radical initiators are known for curing polybutadiene (see Aoki's table). These initiators are superior to peroxides in the resulting bending strength, bending modulus, heat distortion (see Aoki's table) and crosslinking amount (col 1 line 48-52 of Aoki). Furthermore, these initiators do not suffer from the odors etc of peroxides (col 1 line 45-49 of Amtmann). It would have been obvious to choose Aoki's initiator in place of Higuchi's peroxides for the expected improvements.

Claims 1-13,16,17,22-27 and 30-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan '403 in view of Aoki '763 or Amtmann '080.

Sullivan (abstract) suggests golf balls having a dual core and a dual cover. The inner cover is hard while the outer cover is hard (col 8 line 46). The outer cover can be a urethane (abstract). One of the core layers is based on polybutadiene/zndiacrylate/peroxide (table 14). Sullivan names peroxides as suitable free radical initiators (col 30 line 33), but doesn't mention applicant's class of initiators.

Art Unit: 1712

Such free radical initiators are known for curing polybutadiene (see Aoki's table). These initiators are superior to peroxides in the resulting bending strength, bending modulus, heat distortion (see Aoki's table) and crosslinking amount (col 1 line 48-52 of Aoki). Furthermore, these initiators do not suffer from the odors etc of peroxides (col 1 line 45-49 of Amtmann). It would have been obvious to choose Aoki's initiator in place of Sullivan's peroxides for the expected improvements.

Claims 1-13,15,25-27 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison '721 in view of Aoki '763 or Amtmann '080.

Harrison suggests multilayer golf balls (abstract). The core is a blend of polybutadiene and a thermoplastic (example 1). Aperoxide is used to cure the composition (col 4 line 25). Harrison does not suggest applicant's class of initiators.

Such free radical initiators are known for curing polybutadiene (see Aoki's table). These initiators are superior to peroxides in the resulting bending strength, bending modulus, heat distortion (see Aoki's table) and crosslinking amount (col 1 line 48-52 of Aoki). Furthermore, these initiators do not suffer from the odors etc of peroxides (col 1 line 45-49 of Amtmann). It would have been obvious to choose Aoki's initiator in place of Harrison's peroxides for the expected improvements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Buttner whose telephone number is 571-272-1084. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 10 to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski, can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/614,325 Page 5

Art Unit: 1712

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Buttner

DAVID J. BUTTNER PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/29/04

Dough Brother